



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,381	07/25/2003	Kenneth Willian	ETS-0205	3909

21269 7590 03/23/2007
PEPPER HAMILTON LLP
ONE MELLON CENTER, 50TH FLOOR
500 GRANT STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

EXAMINER

JOO, JOSHUA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/627,381

Applicant(s)

WILLIAN ET AL.

Examiner

Joshua Joo

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

Response to Remarks filed 1/12/2007

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/12/2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 1/12/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that:

4. (1) Claim 1 requires that information be distributed to a plurality of presentation devices because claim 1 requires distribution over a plurality of delivery channels.

5. In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees that distribution over a plurality of delivery channels requires information to be distributed to a plurality of presentation devices. Krasnoiarov teaches of communicating and posting content comprising images, sounds, and video for a user of a user terminal (Paragraphs 0006; 0056; 0098; 0121). Communicating images, sounds and video content to the user would require a video channel and audio channel, therefore a plurality of delivery channels. Therefore, distribution over a plurality of delivery channels does not require a plurality of presentation devices as identified in Applicant's specification.

Art Unit: 2154

6. (2) A delivery channel is identified in Applicant's specification as a connection between a location wherein information is compiled and one or more presentation devices. Krasnoiarov teaches of distributing the resulting content to a single user terminal over a single delivery channel between the main server and the user terminal. As such, Krasnoiarov does not teach distribution over a plurality of delivery channels.

7. In response, Examiner respectfully notes that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a delivery channel identified as a connection between a location wherein information is compiled and one or more presentation devices) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant is reminded that claims 1 and 12 do not define such a location or even a device, and the Examiner is not interpreting the connection between the server and user terminal as the plurality of delivery channel. The claimed plurality of delivery channels are interpreted as the channels used to present images, sounds, and video content to the user of the user terminal.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2154

9. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 11-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasnoiarov et al, US Publication #2002/0156812 (Krasnoiarov hereinafter), in view of Gardaz et al, US Publication #2004/0109197 (Gardaz hereinafter).

10. As per claims 1 and 12, Krasnoiarov teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method for converting a plurality of files to different formats. Krasnoiarov's teachings comprise of:

providing a user interface that enables a user to enter a request for converting a plurality of deliverables to the formats suitable for presentation, each deliverable including an associated content item and a corresponding associated format to which to convert the associated content item (Paragraph 0046. User requests personalized set of content components. Paragraph 0105. User indicates display preferences for each component.);

preparing the associated content items for conversion based on the corresponding associated formats (Paragraph 0057. Generates components.);

converting the associated content items using a plurality of parallel processing threads (Paragraph 0057; 0059; 0063. Threads in parallel processing. Each thread obtains converted components from component servers such as non-HTML to HTML, XML to HTML.), each thread corresponding to an associated content item for conversion to a corresponding associated format (Paragraph 0060-0061. Each thread is assigned to a component.);

compiling the converted deliverables for distribution over a plurality of delivery channels (Paragraph 0006. Content may comprise of HTML, XML, images, sounds, and video. Paragraph 0057. VoiceXML. Paragraph 0098. Content is assembled.); and

posting the content to the delivery channels (Paragraph 0006. Content may comprise of HTML, XML, images, sounds, and video. Paragraph 0098; 0121. Post assembled content to the user.).

Art Unit: 2154

11. Krasnoiarov teaches substantial features of the claimed invention including parallel processing wherein a plurality of threads work in parallel to process user's request, and each thread corresponding to an associated content item for conversion to a corresponding associated format, wherein component servers convert the associated content items. However, Krasnoiarov does not specifically teach of each thread converting the associated content item to the corresponding associated format.

Gardaz teaches of a server that processes threads in parallel (Paragraph 0163; 0182), wherein the server also converts files from one format to another (Paragraphs 0062; 0095; 0108).

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Krasnoiarov and Gardaz because both teachings are similar in that they deal with parallel processing and the converting of files to different formats. Furthermore, the teachings of Gardaz for processing threads in parallel for the conversion of files would enhance the efficiency of Krasnoiarvo's system by decreasing the time required to process client's request.

13. As per claims 2 and 13, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, wherein preparing the associated content items for conversion comprises retrieving the associated content items from a database (Paragraph 0060. Component servers.).

14. As per claims 3 and 14, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, wherein preparing the associated content items for conversion comprises customizing the associated content items (Paragraph 0105. User request includes specifying how to generate a component. User preference.).

15. As per claims 4 and 15, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, wherein customizing the associated content items comprises embedding within the associated content items objects related to the presentation (Paragraph 0105. Presentation of content. Display preferences for each component.) and distribution of

Art Unit: 2154

the associated content items (Paragraph 0098; 0121. Content is assembled and posted to the requesting client.).

16. As per claims 6 and 16, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, further comprising receiving a request to convert the plurality of deliverables to the plurality of formats suitable for presentation (Paragraph 0046. User requests personalized content components. Paragraph 0006. Content may comprise of HTML, XML, images, sounds, and video. Paragraph 0057. VoiceXML), the request including a selected delivery channel over which to distribute the converted deliverables (Paragraph 0097. Content is assembled and returned to the user. Paragraph 0052; 0057. Establish TCP/IP connection. HTTP protocol.).

17. As per claims 8 and 17, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, further comprising distributing the converted deliverables over the selected delivery channel (Paragraph 0097. Content is assembled and returned to the user. Paragraph 0052; 0057. Establish TCP/IP connection. HTTP protocol.).

18. As per claims 9 and 18, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, further comprising presenting the converted deliverables at a presentation client (Paragraph 0105. Request for presentation of content. Paragraph 0121. Post assembled content.).

19. As per claims 11 and 20, Krasnoiarov teaches the invention, wherein presenting the deliverables at the presentation client comprises presenting an audible version of the deliverables at the presentation client (Paragraph 0006; 0105. Content may comprise of HTML, XML, images, sounds, and video. Paragraph 0057. Convert content. VoiceXML.).

Art Unit: 2154

20. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasnoiarov and Gardaz, in view of Alonso et al, US Patent #6,184,878 (Alonso hereinafter).

21. As per claim 5, Krasnoiarov teaches the method of converting content to a page description language and converting the page description language to the format suitable for presentation (Paragraph 0057; 0105. Convert non-HTML into HTML. XML into HTML). However, Krasnoiarov does not specifically teach the process comprising of parsing the associated content items to identify content to be presented and converting the parsed content to a page description language.

Alonso teaches of parsing a web page to identify HTML content and converting the HTML page into a video page (Col 4, line 66-Col 5, line 15).

22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Krasnoiarov, Gardaz, and Alonso because all three teachings deal with the converting of content from one format to another. Furthermore, the teachings of Alonso to parse and identify content to convert formats would allow identification of content requiring conversion and providing an explanation of the process of converting content from one format to another.

23. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasnoiarov and Gardaz, in view of Huetsch et al, US Publication #2002/0049842 (Huetsch hereinafter).

24. As per claim 7, Krasnoiarov does not specifically teach the method of claim 6, further comprising logging the request in a request history.

Huetsch teaches of maintaining a client request history (Paragraph 0037).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Krasnoiarov, Gardaz, and Huetsch to maintain a client request history, which

Art Unit: 2154

would allow efficient processing of user requests through caching content and routing requests to an appropriate process.

26. Claims 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krasnoiarov and Gardaz, in view of Gillford et al, US Publication #2003/0123622 (Gifford hereinafter).

27. As per claims 10 and 19, Krasnoiarov does not specifically teach of presenting a printed version of the deliverables at the presentation client.

Gifford teaches of receiving content, where the content may be converted to a printed version such as FAX messages (Paragraph 0156).

28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Krasnoiarov, Gardaz, and Gillford because all three teachings deal with converting content for presentation to a user. The teachings of Gifford to convert data into printed version would enhance the system of Krasnoiarov and Gardaz by allowing the user to receive content in additional different formats.

Conclusion

29. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8AM to 5PM and every other Friday.

Art Unit: 2154

31. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

NATHAN J. FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

32. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see [http://pair-](http://pair-direct.uspto.gov)

[direct.uspto.gov](http://pair-direct.uspto.gov). Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 7, 2007
JJ